

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application now contains claims 1 through 24. Claims 14 and 20 have been amended to require that linking group "L" be a carbon-carbon single bond or one of the preferred linking groups described at page 15, first full paragraph, of the original specification (alkylene linkage, diacyl linkage, and sulfur linkage). Applicants submit that in making the noted claim amendments no new matter has been presented.

Claims 1 through 13 have been deemed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 18 and 24, claiming certain compounds of Formula I (wherein Ar is mononuclear heterocyclic moiety and L is selected from specific alkylene, diacyl and sulfur linkages) and lubricating oil compositions containing same, were objected to only for depending from rejected base claims (claims 14 and 20, respectively). Claims 14 through 17 and 19 through 23 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,206,407 to Lutwack (erroneously referred to in the Office Action as U.S. Patent No. 3,206,467 and hereinafter referred to as "the Lutwack patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,652,201 to Papay et al. (hereinafter "the Papay et al. patent").

The Lutwack patent is directed to certain oligomers of triazine in which triazine moieties are linked via amino, thio-alkyl or thio-amino linking groups, which compounds are described as useful antioxidants for organic functional fluids. The Papay et al. patent was cited only to establish that the use of high molecular weight dispersants, in combination with other additives, in lubricating oil compositions was known. As noted above, claims 14 and 20 have been amended to require that the soot-dispersing compounds of Formula I claimed therein comprise mononuclear heterocyclic moieties linked via a carbon-carbon bond or an alkylene, diacyl or sulfur linkage. Such compounds are neither disclosed nor suggested by the Lutwack patent. Therefore, Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 14 and 20, as well as that of claims 15 through 19, which each depend directly or indirectly from claim 14, and claims 21 through 24, which each depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 20, is neither taught nor fairly suggested by the Lutwack patent, the Papay et al. patent, or any combination thereof.

Appln. No. 10/712,932
Amdt. dated August 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 12, 2007

Based upon the foregoing, applicants submit that the present claims distinguish over the prior art of record and that this application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that all rejections presented under 35 USC Section 103(a) be withdrawn, and the application now be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jacob M. Levine".

Jacob M. Levine
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,509

Infineum, USA, L.P.
1900 East Linden Avenue
Linden, NJ 07036
(908) 474-2418